

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks according the instruction of Examiner's Office Action dated 12/18/2003, the applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early issued allowance earnestly solicited.

-- Specification

In responsive to Office Action 12/18/2003:

The specifications were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 132, because they include the new matters.

In responsive to this; Applicant cancel the "cushioning effect" and "The metering mechanism divides the even mixed raw material equally" according Examiner's Office Action instruction dated 12/18/2003.

-- Claim

In responsive to Office Action 12/18/2003:

Claims 1,3,4,5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garms (US 1,198,209).

In responsive to this, applicant has to stress the present invention demonstrates more novelty way of gear layout in the house; and it is totally different from shown on Grams (US 1,198,209) and Mylo (US 3,266,430). There are three remarkable differences among them:

1. My invention uses fewer gears than does the prior art mentioned above.

2. My invention; referring FIG 2, leads the raw material according the longitudinal layout of mechanism and gear that makes raw material is not only mixed and blended well but also falls vertically according the rule of principle of gravity.
3. It is quite clear my invention will not stock raw material while it operates. My invention forces the raw material follows the generatrix of linear design, which is different to Gram's and Mylo's. Feed inlet 22 is disposed on the top and discharge pipe 27 is disposed on the bottom that makes raw material move faster than Gram's and Mylo's.

Applicant must keep Claim 2 as old version to make this present invention in whole unit.

If without the claim 2, my invention will incomplete.

Applicant believe the context and object and the function of my invention make lots difference to those prior art. And more detail explanation of the operation of the present invention shows on this amendment

Request for Constructive Assistance

The applicant has made a diligent effort in amending the original claim and specification in order to put the present claim and specification in to condition for allowance. Should the Examiner find any more area in need of correction, the applicant requests for constructive suggestions from the Examiner as pursuant to MPEP 706.03(d), and more particularly, if further objections be found with the claim and specification, for the Examiner to draft one or more allowable claims as pursuant to MPEP 707.7(j).

Respectfully submitted,



Applicant

Lin, Jun-Rong